

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Initially, applicants note an IDS filed on November 8, 2006 has not been acknowledged as considered. Applicants request the form PTO-1449 filed with that IDS be initialed and returned in a next action.

Claims 1-3, 5-13, and 15-29 are pending in this application. Claims 4 and 14 are canceled by the present response without prejudice. Claims 1-29 were objected to for informalities. Claims 1-3, 12-14, 20, 21, and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as clearly anticipated by JP 56-88650 to Ooyama et al. (herein “Ooyama”). Claims 1, 2, 4, 12-14, 20, 21, and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as clearly anticipated by JP 08-331,181 to Yamaguchi et al. (herein “Yamaguchi”). Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Ooyama and U.S. patent 4,228,376 to Mabuchi. Claims 5, 7, 8, 9, 15, 17, 23, 24, and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Ooyama and JP 06-189504 to Yaguchi et al. (herein “Yaguchi”). Claims 6 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Ooyama and Yaguchi and further in view of Mabuchi. Claims 10, 18, 22, and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Ooyama and JP 55-133651 to Ito. Claims 11, 25, 19, and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Ooyama and Ito and Yaguchi.

Addressing first the objection to claims 1-29, that objection is traversed by the present response.

Claims 1-29 were objected to as the structure of the base board was unclear, and particularly how it was formed for example of a conductive material. The claims are amended by the present response to clarify the base board “including a layer of a conductive material into which a plane conductive pattern is formed”. That subject matter is fully supported by the original specification for example at page 8, line 19 et seq., and that

language clarifies the structure of the baseboard. In view of the presently submitted amendments the objection to claims 1-29 is believed to be overcome by the present response.

Addressing now the above-noted prior art rejections, the rejections are traversed by the present response.

Independent claim 1 is amended by the present response to incorporate features from previously pending dependent claim 4 with an additional clarification. The other independent claims are similarly amended.

Specifically, independent claim 1 recites:

a support base configured to support the rotation shaft of the rotor,

wherein the electrode brushes include respective external terminals configured to provide an external connection to the direct current motor, and

wherein the electrode brushes and the external terminals of the electrode brushes are fixed on the support base, and the external terminals of the electrode brushes protrude outward from an outside surface of the support base.

The above-noted claimed features are fully supported by the original specification at for example page 9, lines 20 et seq. With reference to Figure 1 in the present specification as a non-limiting example, external terminals 16c of the electrode brushes 16 protrude outward from a support base 13. That structure is believed to clearly distinguish over the applied art.

First, with respect to the features recited in previously pending dependent Claim 4, the outstanding Office Action cited Yamaguchi or a combination of Ooyama and Mabuchi. Applicants traverse those rejections.

First, Yamaguchi discloses brushes 11 in contact with a brush base 12, and at one side utilizing an additional terminal 13 to connect to the brush base 12. Thus, Yamaguchi recites three different elements providing an output of an electrode brush 11.

In contrast to that structure in Yamaguchi, in the claims as written the external terminals of the electrode brushes themselves protrude outward from an outside surface of the support base. Yamaguchi does not disclose or suggest such a structure as Yamaguchi discloses the terminals of the brush 11 merely contact a portion on the brush base 12, which then in turn contacts a terminal 13.

Moreover, applicants note that in the claims as written the electrical parts mounting base board includes “a layer of a conducting material into which a plane conductive pattern is formed”. Yamaguchi does not appear to disclose or suggest that a feature.

Thereby, the claims as written are believed to clearly distinguish over Yamaguchi.

With respect to the combination of Ooyama and Mabuchi, the claims are also believed to clearly distinguish over that combination of teachings. That rejection relied on Mabuchi to disclose brushes including terminals for connection to a power supply. However, Mabuchi clearly does not disclose or suggest any electrode brushes including terminals that “protrude outward from an outside surface of [a] support base”, as recited in the claims. Thus, Mabuchi does not cure the deficiencies of Ooyama with respect to the claims as written.

As each of the independent claims is amended to recite the features discussed above, each of the claims is believed to clearly distinguish over the applied art.

Applicants also draw attention to amended dependent claims 5, 15, 27, and 29 directed to the “rotation detecting brush”. Those claims now further recite that element “being arcuately curved outward from the rotation shaft”. According to such a claimed structure, and with reference to Figure 10 in the present specification as a non-limiting example, rotation detecting brushes 17a, 17b that are arcuately outward curved can provide a signal indicating an operation of a direct current motor. None of the applied art teaches or suggests such a structure.

The outstanding rejections relied on Yaguchi to disclose a rotation detection brush, but Yaguchi clearly fail to disclose or suggest any such brush “being arcuately curved outward from the rotation shaft”. Thereby, dependent claims 5, 15, 27, and 29 further distinguish over the applied art.

Applicants also note additional dependent claims 6 and 16 further recite that external terminal of the rotation detecting brush “also protrudes outward from an outside surface of the support base”. Such further features also further distinguish over the applied art, and thus further dependent claims 6 and 16 even further distinguish over the applied art.

In view of the present response applicants respectfully submit the claims as written positively recite features neither taught nor suggested by the applied art, and thus the claims as written distinguish over the applied art.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 03/06)

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
James J. Kulbaski  
Registration No. 34,648

Surinder Sachar  
Registration No. 34,423

JJK/SNS/law